

## Table 3-8

### Decision Summary Outline

1	<b>Project Name, Location, and Description</b>	<p>Name, location, address</p> <p>Area of the project location, topography, relationship to nearby floodplain</p> <p>Adjacent land uses</p> <p>Natural resource use</p> <p>Location and distance to nearby populations</p> <p>General surface water and groundwater populations</p> <p>Surface and subsurface features, for example number and volume of tanks, lagoons, structures, and drums</p> <p>Current and past owner/operator</p>
2	<b>Project History and Enforcement Activities</b>	<p>History of project activities that led to current problems</p> <p>History of federal and state SIs and RAs conducted under CERCLA, RCRA, or other authorities</p> <p>History of CERCLA enforcement activities for a project</p>
3	<b>Community Relations History</b>	<p>Major community relations activities.</p> <p>Explain how the public participation requirements of CERCLA (Sections 113 and 117) were satisfied during the remedial process.</p>
4	<b>Scope and Role</b>	<p>Scope of the problems addressed by the RA.</p> <p>Describe the role of the action within the overall site remediation strategy.</p>
5	<b>Statutory Determinations</b>	<p>Explain whether or not the selected remedy satisfies the statutory preference for remedies employing treatment that reduces toxicity, mobility, or volume.</p>
6	<b>Summary of Project Location Characteristics</b>	<p>Contamination and affected media, including types and characteristics of contaminants (e.g., toxicity and mobility), quantities of contaminants and concentrations of contaminants.</p> <p>Known or suspected sources of contamination, and</p> <p>Location of contamination and known or potential routes of migration.</p> <p>Identify who used area and document</p>
7	<b>Summary of Project Location Risks</b>	<p>Summary of the results of the baseline risk assessment conducted for the project.</p> <p>Provide the rationale for the lead agency's undertaking of a particular response action or invoking the "no action" alternative. The information presented in this section must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify contaminants of concern (i.e., indicator chemicals)</li> <li>• Summarize the result of the exposure assessment</li> <li>• Summarize the toxicity assessment of indicator chemicals</li> <li>• Summarize the risk characterization, addressing potential or actual carcinogenic risks, noncarcinogenic risks, and environmental risks</li> </ul>

Chapter 3 – Table 3-8, Decision Summary Outline

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe analytic methods used in making the risk calculations</li> </ul>
8	<b>Documentation of Significant Changes</b>	<p>Explanation of any significant changes from the preferred alternative originally presented in the proposed plan per Section 117 of CERCLA. If the selected remedy reflects significant changes from the preferred alternative, this section of the Decision Summary should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the preferred alternative presented in the proposed plan</li> <li>Describe the significant changes</li> <li>Explain the reason(s) for such changes</li> </ul>
9	<b>Description of Alternatives</b>	<p>The objective of this section is to provide an understanding of the alternative waste management strategies developed for the site and their specific components. Each alternative should be described in terms of the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Treatment components, including treatment technologies that will be used; type and volume of waste treated; contaminated media addressed; process sizing; treatment levels [e.g., RCRA land disposal restrictions or maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)]; residual levels [e.g., clean closure, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), delisting]; implementation requirements; and assumptions, limitations, and uncertainties.</li> <li>Containment components, including type and quantity of waste(s) to be contained, quantity of untreated waste and treatment residuals to be contained in terms of the type or degree of risks they pose, and type of closure that will be implemented.</li> <li>Institutional controls, including short-term controls during remediation and long-term controls as part of RA-O and LTM.</li> <li>Groundwater classification, e.g., Class I, II, or III.</li> <li>Estimated time for implementation.</li> <li>Estimated capital, LTM, and present worth costs.</li> <li>The major ARARs associated with the various components of the waste management strategy.</li> </ul>

Chapter 3 – Table 3-8, Decision Summary Outline

10	<b>Summary of Comparative Analysis of Alternatives</b>	<p>In this section, the relative performance of the alternatives should be summarized by highlighting the key differences among the alternatives in relation to the following nine evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall protection of human health and the environment, which addresses whether or not a remedy provides adequate protection and describes how risks posed by each pathway are eliminated, reduced, or controlled through treatment, engineering controls, or institutional controls.</li> <li>• Compliance with ARARs, which addresses whether a remedy will meet all of the ARARs of other environmental statutes.</li> <li>• Long-term effectiveness and permanence, which refers to the ability of a remedy to maintain reliable protection of human health and the environment over time once cleanup goals have been met.</li> <li>• Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume; which is the anticipated performance of the treatment technologies a remedy may employ.</li> <li>• Short-term effectiveness, which addresses the period of time needed to achieve protection and any adverse impacts on human health and the environment that may be posed during the construction and implementation period, until cleanup goals are achieved.</li> <li>• Implement ability, which is the technical and administrative feasibility of a remedy, including the availability of materials and services needed to implement a particular option.</li> <li>• Cost, which includes estimated capital, RA-O, and LTM costs, and net present worth costs.</li> <li>• State acceptance, which addresses other agency's comments. Where the USACE is the lead for the ROD, EPA's acceptance of the selected remedy should be addressed under this heading.</li> <li>• Community acceptance, which summarizes the public's general response to the alternatives described in the proposed plan and RI/FS report. The specific responses to public comments should be addressed in the Responsiveness Summary section of the ROD/decision document.</li> </ul>
----	--	--

Created By: JFL	Issue No.:0	Revision No.:0
Approved By: JC	Chapter 3 - Table 3-8	Date: 30 September 1999